

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/077,765 | 02/20/2002 | Kazuhiro Ishida | 017446-0323 | 3462 | |
| 22428 FOLEY AND | 7590 09/22/201 LARDNER LLP | EXAMINER | | | |
| SUITE 500 | | ALVAREZ, RAQUEL | | | |
| 3000 K STRE | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | , | | 3682 | 3682 | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 09/22/2011 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/077,765 | ISHIDA, KAZUHIRO | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| RAQUEL ALVAREZ | 3682 | | |

| | RAQUEL ALVAREZ | 3682 | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 12 September 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THI | S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | |
| application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple | he reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi pplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the optication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request or Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filled within one of the following time | | | | | | | |
| The period for reply expires <u>4 months from the mailing date</u> | of the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| The period for reply expires on; (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: (I box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO | | | | | | | | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). so fitime may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFH 1.136(a). The date- have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL. | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f | iled within two month: | s of the date of | | | | | |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t They raise new issues that would require further cor They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | nsideration and/or search (see NOT | | cause | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | | ducing or simplifying th | ne issues for | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mnliant Amendment (| PTOL-224) | | | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | inpliant Americanient (| 102-324). | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | be entered and an e | xplanation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a | | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | | | | | | |
| I. \(\text{The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \(\text{See Continuation Sheet.} \) | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Other: | | | | | | | | |
| | /Raquel Alvarez/ | | | | | | | |
| | Primary Examiner Art II | nit 3682 | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Continuation of 11 does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Guptis service is associated with call connections, but that the instant application pertains to accepting registration of a given operation and is irrelevant to call connections. The Examiner wants to point out that the cliaims were rejected under 103 and therefore should be argued accordingly. Nakamura teaches gistering and cancellation procedures pertaining to registration of a contract. Nakamura is silent as to being able to immediately activate or cancel a service. Gupta teaches on col. 6, lines 44.47 and col. 8, lines 7-12 immediately activating and deactivating a phone service. Therefore contrary of Applicant's the combination of Nakamura and Gupta teach accepting registration and cancellation of a given operations at an arbitrary limiting on a terminal sure side.

Applicant argues that the concept of "standby screen" does not exist in Kenney. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because Kenney teaches displaying the information in a telephone screen when the telephone is not in use (standby screen).

Applicant argues that Gupta does not teach "on the spot" and Kenney does not teach "standby screen". The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because as stated above, Gupta teaches on the spot activation and deactivation/cancellation and Kenney teaches standby screen